C.d.1001 (1)

(3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. ...3147..../2004

PETITIONER : Sudhram, Age 46 years, S/o. Sunhar
R/o. Village Post Gobripath, Tahsil Kota,
District Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1] State of Chhattisgarh,
Through Secretary, Public Works Deptt.
Mantralaya, DKS Bhawan-Raipur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 3143/04
Presented by Shri Sahoo Sahu
dated 5-9-04

2] Sub-Divisional Officer, PWD, Kota,
Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(44)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. No. 3147 of 2004

Petitioner : Sudhram

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 3188 of 2004

Petitioner : Mohit Ram

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 3279 of 2004

Petitioner : Durdeshi

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 4929 of 2004

Petitioners : Shobha Ram and others

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 4830 of 2004

Petitioner : Johan Bijhwar

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 5027 of 2004

Petitioners : Leela Bai and another

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. No. 1103 of 2005

Petitioners : Bajraha Ram and others

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

And

W. P. (s) No. 614 of 2007

Petitioners : Juthel Yadav and others

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

(95)

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri, J

Mr. Ashok Vaishnav, counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st day of February, 2007)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Panel lawyer appearing for the respondents/State jointly submit that the facts of the present case are similar to that of in W. P. No. 454/2005 (Ram Prasad Yadav & others vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others), which was allowed vide order dated 4.1.2007. They further submit that the question of law involved is also the same.
2. In view of the above stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, these writ petitions are allowed in terms of the order dated 4.1.2007 passed by this Court in W. P. No. 454/2005. No order as to costs.
3. A copy of this order be placed on record in connected writ petitions.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu